Henry D. Gardner

A LONG RANGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO FACILITATE EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION IN THE ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

submitted by -

Arlington County School Board
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22210

initiated by -

Dr. Harold M. Wilson
Associate Superintendent for Instruction
Arlington County Schools
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22210
tel: JA2-770 ext. 9

authorized by -

Mr. Ray E. Reid
Division Superintendent
Arlington County Public Schools
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22210
tel: JA2-7700 ext. 2

fiscal officer -

Mr. Ray E. Reid
Division Superintendent
Arlington County Public Schools
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22210
tel: JA2-7700 ext. 2

Federal Funds Requested:

	Part A (In-Service Training)	$401,940
---	Total Request	$401,940

Duration: Beginning Date: April 15, 1965 Ending Date: June 30, 1970
Date Transmitted: June 9, 1965

Dr. Harold M. Wilson,
Associate Superintendent
for Instruction

Mr. Ray E. Reid,
Division Superintendent

ABSTRACT

A LONG RANGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO FACILITATE EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION IN THE ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

SUBMITTED BY: Arlington County School Board
1426 North Quincy Street
Arlington, Virginia 22210

DIRECTOR OF PROGRAM: A coordinator (to be selected) who will work under Dr. Harold Wilson, Associate Superintendent for Instruction.

OBJECTIVES: An in-service program for teachers, supervisors, administrators and other school personnel designed to create more effective learning situations made available as a result of integration. A continual self-study by school personnel will offer opportunities for examination of their assumptions, practices, informational background, and feelings relating to integration. As a result, new practices and educational programs will evolve that will enable all students to profit from a more effective learning environment.

PROCEDURES:

1. Staff In-Service Training (on a limited basis)
2. Intensive Training of Personnel Specialists for Effective Learning Programs in Integrated Schools
3. Extensive Programs for Continual Staff Development and Effective Curriculum Changes.

TIME SCHEDULE: April 15, 1965 to June 30, 1970

BUDGET:

1965	--	$ 7,050
1965-1966	--	85,280
1966-1967	--	84,190
1967-1968	--	73,340
1968-1969	--	75,540
1969-1970	--	76,540
		$401.940

ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

A LONG RANGE STAFF DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM TO FACILITATE EFFECTIVE INTEGRATION IN THE ARLINGTON COUNTY PUBLIC SCHOOLS

PROBLEM

"By unanimous vote, the Arlington County School Board passed a resolution on June 4, 1964 which called for the establishment of a Committee of Citizens to advise the Board on Criteria for Defining School Attendance Areas. A second resolution that evening set the membership of the committee at 19; to be appointed in the following manner: 3 designated by the County Council of P-TAs; 1 by the Arlington Civic Federation; 1 by the Chamber of Commerce; 1 by the American Association of University Women; 2 by the combined Arlington civil rights organizations (Arlington Council on Human Relations, Catholic Inter-Racial Council of Northern Virginia, Community Council for Social Progress, Congress on Racial Equality, National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Arlington Chapter; United Church Women of Arlington); 4 by the Negro Schools' P-TAs; 1 by the Arlington Ministerial Association; 1 by the League of Women Voters, 5 members-at-large (1 appointed by each member of the Board).

"This committee was directed to meet with the Board for the first time on July 2, and originally was to have reported its conclusions within 60 days after this date. However, following a closer look at the many factors necessary to be studied in order to accurately evaluate criteria - plus the practical difficulty of getting 19 persons to meetings during the summer months - the reporting date was amended by the Board to 'not later than December 1, 1964.' This does not, of course, preclude an earlier reporting date should the committee find itself prepared to do so.

"Before April 15th of each school year, the School Board is legally responsible for notifying the parents or guardians of each child in the school system of any change of school attendance area. Therefore, the School Board is obliged to make known any proposed changes in School Attendance Areas soon enough that parents and other interested citizens may appear before them in open public meeting and present their opinions for or against proposed changes, or requests for additional changes.

"Some of the present school boundaries reflect longstanding criteria for attendance areas which may or may not be practical for the needs of 1965. Certainly we recognize that these crtieria have met some criticism, and it is this Board's desire to assure that these or any other criteria for attendance areas are, on balance, the most equitable that can be applied to our long-range school growth. Consequently, we are asking that this committee go to whatever lengths necessary to develop criteria that can be clearly recognized and fairly applied by the School Board."[1]

The above charge and commitment was made and has been carried out by the Arlington County School Board. As a result, the Committee of Citizens made recommendations to the Board which have as their goal the following:

PROBLEM (cont'd)

". . . In its broadest sense, the aim of public education will be realized only when equality of opportunity for a fine education is made available to all of our citizens. To accomplish this, we must provide an educationally sound program, with facilities needing no apology. Nor should these facilities be subject to challenge because they are unequal. Our aspirations are within the grasp of our community.—

"This realized goal is not accomplished so long as

(1) certain children are artificially segregated by race because they live within school districts whose boundaries were at some previous time fixed to preserve segregation

(2) certain children are required by virtue of their residence to attend schools that do not meet the standards for the best education that can be given today. . . ."[2]

Arlington County, a suburb of Washington, D. C., has a school population of 26,700 pupils. Of this number, approximately 2,550 are Negroes. The system was completely segregated by race until 1959 when some individual students were integrated by Federal Court order. Since that time, we have moved toward complete integration of students and faculty as ordered by the United States District Court. The most recent decision rendered on October 31, 1963 declared that, although the Arlington County School Board plans to close the senior high section of Hoffman-Boston, the one all-Negro secondary school, the junior high in the same building and the elementary facilities would be unaltered. The court decision was clarified as follows:

"We do not now pass upon the validity of existing districts or districts to be created. We cite the situation merely as another indication that the process of transition from segregation to desegregation is not yet finished, since the Board itself apparently recognized the necessity for future changes to meet the demands of the Negro community and to effect better administration of the school system. The School Board has the primary authority and responsibility to bring the school system into complete conformity with the law. . . . A good faith beginning of compliance might be a defense to a contempt citation for violating an injunction; it is no ground for rescission. The injunction must be reinstated."

Mr. L. Ecker-Racz, Chairman of the Arlington County School Board, in a statement presented on March 11, 1965, summarized the position of the Board regarding integration as follows:

"1) The present boundary, particularly in the case of Hoffman-Boston, remains today as it was drawn years ago when State law prescribed segregation on the basis of race. It is probably as glaring an example of discrimination as survives. The State law that mandated this boundary has long since been declared unconstitutional by the highest Court in the land. Your School Board cannot in good conscience continue to live with it.

These statistics show that we are in the middle stages of desegregation. While it is true that we have few schools, three at the secondary level and one at the elementary that will have ten percent or more Negroes in the school population, our planning reflects the goal of the Committee of Citizens. "In its broadest sense, the aim of public education will be realized only when equality of opportunity for a fine education is made available to all of our citizens."

When a school moves from segregation to integration, the reassignment of pupils and teachers is merely the first step, prejudice and discrimination continue and sometimes increase within the schools. These latter conditions sometimes are accentuated by differing value systems of various pupils, grouping of pupils solely by scores achieved on standardized tests, and the reflections of home and community feelings by pupils, teachers, and other professional staff members. The following quotation from a report on Research Conference on Education and Cultural Deprivation held at the University of Chicago describes one of the major dilemmas that can arise from integration when just the shifting of pupils and teachers is done:

> "Within the school itself the poor relationship between teachers and pupils, the use of tests for purposes of classification rather than diagnosis, the primers and readers, and the curriculum as a whole soon damage severely the confidence and the basic self-esteem of the child from low socio-economic groups. Finally, his subordinate place in the school, as in society, tends to weaken his self-esteem. This self-depreciation is typical of all low-status groups and is the result of their being stigmatized in most relationships with dominant groups, including teachers. It results not only in a poor self-image, but often in self-contempt beneath the mask of hostility and resentment which the pupil shows to the teacher."[3]

Further implications for schools are pointed out in the same report:

> "It is when the negative attitudes and feelings of individuals are translated into institutional practices (school, social welfare agencies, churches, police and courts, business and industry) that the Negro (or any other group) most despairs. Under these conditions there can be no hope or optimism about the future and little incentive to work for distant goals.
>
> "We do not regard the school as the agency for the solution of the social ills of a society. However, we do regard the schools as providing a setting in which all can learn under as nearly ideal conditions as possible. Furthermore, the school is responsible not only for the learning of subject matter and intellectual skills, but also for the learning of basic attitudes and values.
>
> "There is considerable evidence that teachers (both white and Negro) respond differentially to white and Negro children as well as to children of different social classes. We regard such differential treatment as harmful to the learning of the child as well as harmful to his own self-perception."[4]

FOOTNOTES

1. Arlington County School Board, 1965. "Report of Advisory Committee on Criteria for Defining School Attendance Areas," pp. 8-9.

2. Ibid., pp. 2-3.

3. Benjamin S. Bloom, Allison Davis, and Robert Hess, Compensatory Education for Cultural Deprivation, (Department of Education, University of Chicago, 1964), p. 21.

4. Ibid.